

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 15 - 70006
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Julie Diaz Defendant.)
Speedy Trial Act from <u>Jan. 7</u> , 2015 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of	rd on Jan. 7, 2015, the Court excludes time under the Jan. 30, 2015 and finds that the ends of justices erved the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance we See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)	ould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	aplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial plished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. v).
——————————————————————————————————————	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. v). Let under Rule S.I.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	1 0 0 40,
DATED: 1-7=15	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney